

(The reason for this is that differentiation within this category will create, in effect, 5 levels - CO, SC+, SC, SC-, NI when the intent was to decrease the number of levels.)

- There should be no distribution determined or targeted within SC. That means we should not determine any % for hi, med, and lo within the category. This would in fact create the levels indicated above.

- If the department chooses to use a qualifier (hi, med, lo) within the SC category - it is ok but should NOT be communicated. Again, this will create, in effect, three levels in the category. (Initial opinion of just a few senior team members is that we should not determine a hi, med, lo and then not communicate it. Org rev now involves many people and this info will get out and will be negatively perceived has not being totally up front in this process.)

- Ranking is an option that is available, but is not required.

(Initial input from several senior team members indicates that ranking should be a tool the senior team uses for 12+ category - but should not and does not need to be used for 11 and below category.)

- The pay system may offer some flexibility within the SC category.

My takeaway from all of this is that the manager would have some flexibility in determining pay within this category. This has merit for several reasons:

1. pay increases to assure equitability may necessitate manager discretion (for example: below minimum adjustments, or certain groups paid less, etc.)

2. the manager knows the individual (11 and below) better and can provide the fairest initial appraisal after hearing the org rev information

3. Valerie and Co. would need to audit to assure we meet financial targets in merit increases and equitability across groups.

Please give me or Valerie your feedback asap (by Tues. am if possible) as org reviews are in progress and we should not create 3 piles of SC in these org reviews as that will establish a 5 grade system.

Thanks,

Cathy

P.S. Val asked me to do this since she is on a separate computer system.

Note for Ellis, Cathy

From: Ellis, Cathy
Date: Mon, Nov 14, 1994 9:19 AM
Subject: Interview in London
To: Bourlas, Manny

Manny:

I understand that we have been designated to interview Proctor in London in the next few weeks. I also understand that this would be a virtual fly-over in that we leave one day, arrive the next, and return that same day. Please confirm my understandings and if you want to throw out a few two day options - I will check my calendar.

Cathy

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

2057069628

2057069628A

2057069628B